

LAW LIBRARY JOURNAL

VOLUME 34

JANUARY, 1941

NUMBER 1

Published January, March, May, July, September, November
by the

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF LAW LIBRARIES

COMMITTEE ON LAW LIBRARY JOURNAL

HOBART R. COFFEY, University of Michigan Law Library, *Chairman*
SAMUEL E. THORNE, Northwestern University Law Library, Chicago, Illinois
BENJAMIN O. POOLE, Association of the Bar of the City of New York, New York City
OLIVE C. LATHROP, Detroit Bar Association Library, Detroit, Michigan
OSCAR C. ORMAN, Washington University Library, St. Louis, Missouri
HELEN NEWMAN, Managing Editor, Law Library Journal
The George Washington University Law Library, Washington, D. C.
L. ANDREWS, Assistant Editor in Charge of Advertising, Association of the Bar of the
City of New York, New York City

CONTENTS

PAGE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE ON LIBRARY PROBLEMS HELD AT THE THIRTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMER- ICAN LAW SCHOOLS, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, DECEMBER 27, 1940.....	1
A Catalog for the Small Law Library..... <i>Miles O. Price</i>	1
Report of the Nominating Committee..... <i>William R. Arthur</i>	12
Value of Classification and Pay Plans for Law School Libraries With a Summary of the Work of the Joint Committee	
Discussion..... <i>Alice Daspit</i>	13
Relationship between Work of Committee on Classification and Pay Plans and Work of Joint Committee on Cooperation between A.A.L.S. and A.A.L.L..... <i>William R. Roalfe</i>	19
RECENT COMMENTS.....	22
AMBERLIN HOTEL AT OLD POINT COMFORT, VA., SELECTED AS PLACE OF 36TH ANNUAL MEETING OF A.A.L.L.....	26
REVIEW: The Practices of Law Publishers as They Affect Law Libraries, by <i>George Brown</i> . Reviewed by <i>Harry Bitner</i>	27
BOOK LIST OF NATIONAL REPORTER SYSTEM.....	28
BOOK LIST OF U. S. ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS TO JANUARY 1, 1941 <i>Everett H. Northrop</i>	29
BOOK LIST OF CURRENT AMERICAN STATE REPORTS AND SESSION LAWS.....	33
CHANGES.....	38
SPACE TO ADVERTISERS.....	38

Contents of the LAW LIBRARY JOURNAL are indexed in the INDEX TO LEGAL PERIODICALS.
Subscription price of the LAW LIBRARY JOURNAL to individuals or libraries not members of the
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF LAW LIBRARIES—\$4.00 a year.

For inquiries concerning the LAW LIBRARY JOURNAL or membership in the AMERICAN
ASSOCIATION OF LAW LIBRARIES to: Miss Helen Newman, Managing Editor of the
LAW LIBRARY JOURNAL and Executive Secretary of the AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF LAW LIBRARIES, The George Washington University Law School,
Washington, D. C.

Copyright, 1941, by the American Association of Law Libraries, Washington, D. C.

Printed by National Capital Press, 301 N Street, N. E., Washington, D. C.

Classified as second-class matter March 8, 1937, at the post office at Washington, D. C.,
under the Act of March 3, 1879.



You CAN'T PRACTICE LAW BY MAIL

DID YOU ever attempt to have a client execute a will by mail? If so, the following experience of an attorney will bring back recollections of the difficulties involved.

There was a voluminous exchange of letters and the usual frequent change of mind as to minor beneficiaries. Then came back an undated will, and the attorney after consulting the annotation in 6 A.L.R. 1455, on dating wills, decided that it might be desirable to have it re-executed. The final indignity, however, occurred when the carbon copy was returned with this notation: "I'm tearing up one copy so my husband won't run across it." All hope fled upon examination of the annotation in 48 A.L.R. 297 on destruction of one copy as revocation of the other.

Yes, you need your clients before you, and you need your books and you need the quick information available in the 13,000 annotations in *American Law Reports* covering practical questions such as these.

THE LAWYERS CO-OPERATIVE PUBLISHING CO.
BANCROFT-WHITNEY CO.

- Rochester, N. Y.
- San Francisco, Calif.

LAW LIBRARY JOURNAL

VOLUME 34

JANUARY, 1941

NUMBER 1

PROCEEDINGS OF THE ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE ON LIBRARY PROBLEMS HELD AT THE THIRTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN LAW SCHOOLS, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, DECEMBER 27, 1940*

THE Round Table Conference on Library Problems, held in conjunction with the Thirty-eighth Annual Meeting of the Association of American Law Schools, convened in the Berwyn Room of the Edgewater Beach Hotel at eight-fifteen o'clock on Friday evening, December 27, 1940, Dean Thomas Charles Kimbrough, University of Mississippi School of Law, presiding.

CHAIRMAN KIMBROUGH: Ladies and Gentlemen, we have been asked first to elect a Council for 1942. The plan under which we proceed is to appoint a Nominating Committee which retires at once and reports back the names of the persons to be suggested for the 1942 Council. I am appointing Professor William R. Arthur, Dean Charles J. Hilkey and Dean Benjamin F. Boyer to serve on that committee. I will ask them to retire and nominate five members to be elected for 1942.

While we are waiting for the committee to report, we shall take up the first paper on the program, "A Catalog for the Small Law Library." It is my pleasure to present to you Mr. Miles O. Price, Law Librarian, Columbia University. We are fortunate in having him with us and you will now hear from him.

. . . Mr. Price then presented his prepared paper on "A Catalog for the Small Law Library." . . .

A CATALOG FOR THE SMALL LAW LIBRARY

MILES O. PRICE

Law Librarian, Columbia University

As librarian of a large law library and teacher of a course in law library administration, I am asked many questions by other law librarians, especially

*Published in accordance with the resolution of the American Association of Law Libraries, June 24, 1935:

"... the Editor of the LAW LIBRARY JOURNAL be authorized to publish the papers to be given at future Round Tables on Library Problems of the Association of American Law Schools in the LAW LIBRARY JOURNAL and to continue the program of publishing them until such time as the Association of American Law Schools may see fit to publish them in its own *Handbooks*." 28 L. LIB. J. 97-98. For papers given at previous Round Tables see 28 L. LIB. J. 3, 51, 64, 67; 29 L. LIB. J. 7, 13, 15; 30 L. LIB. J. 1; 32 L. LIB. J. 47—Editor's note.

by those of smaller collections. Most of these questions concern catalogs which is not strange, as, generally speaking, small law libraries have less complete catalogs, if indeed they have any, than any other kind of library. Even large law libraries are likely to be decidedly informal in their catalogs, know of one old and very good bar association library of 70,000 volumes, just recently began the compilation of an adequate catalog, having gotten up to this time with a rudimentary author list.

Many lawyers and even some law school professors fail to see any real use for a catalog, regarding it merely as a useless intermediary between them and the desired books. The reason for this indifference on the part of the users of the small law library is perhaps not far to seek. Some months ago I had occasion to check through the printed and typed catalogs of some law libraries around 15,000 volumes, and I then estimated that about 92 per cent of the volumes were in large sets of law reports, statutes, digests, citation books, encyclopedias, law reviews and the like; leaving only 8 per cent for texts, directories and other separate works. The smaller the library the higher the percentage of sets. (Mr. Orman would put the percentage of texts and other separate materials two or three points higher than my estimate, but we are in essential agreement.) The significance of all this is that at least nine-tenths of the books in a small law school library are such as are kept on open shelves, where every professor and student knows where to find them and, in a general way, what to find in them. In many of these libraries even the texts are also kept, alphabetically arranged on the open shelves. There thus appears to be little need for a library catalog either by author or by subject, and so many law school administrators appear to have believed, to judge by the situation in their libraries.

Why, then, are there so many inquiries from librarians for directions in cataloging their collections? The obvious answer seems to me to be that the library cannot function at anything like maximum efficiency without an adequate catalog, and that these librarians have discovered that fact.

In the first place, to take the most important material in any law library—the reports and statutes—these are by no means so easily kept track of as they seem to believe. Especially of late years there have been many irregular special sessions of state legislatures, and how can a professor engaged in research know that he has seen all the pertinent statutes unless a truthful catalog shows him what were published? There are so many series of reports, especially in England and in states like New York and Pennsylvania, for example, that some record of them is needed, and the catalog would seem to be the most accurate and convenient form.

More important, however, is the need of a good catalog for the separate works, texts, directories, government documents, etc. To be sure, texts are relatively as important or authoritative in law as in other arts and sciences, but they are becoming increasingly numerous and complicated, beyond the capacity of any person really to carry them in his head. I know that many of you can remember fabulous stories of professors and librarians who knew every book

the library and everything in every book, and, like our Professor Powell at Columbia University, could tell you offhand what was stated in "line 7, page 23, of Bigelow," and believe this proves the catalog a superfluity.

In the first place, however, I do not accept these people at face value, even in the days when the law library consisted only of a few reports, the Revised Statutes, Bouvier, Greenleaf, Coke and Blackstone. Even if they actually existed they were more or less unique, and of a now vanished race, and at best they were many years in the training; and when they were absent from the library, sick, or on vacation, things did not go so well. I, myself, right here in Chicago, about thirty years ago was the subject of many such tales by graduate students and faculty in the modern languages at the University of Chicago, but I know they were founded on a good general familiarity with certain limited collections, and isolated lucky guesses, and not on solid knowledge.

But, even if these people ever existed, or existed ten years ago, they could not function well today, though they might, by dint of long application and a good memory, put up a good bluff. Legal material is too complicated and varied today for the catalog existing only in the heads of the professors or library staff.

When I entered law library work eleven years ago the old days of only reports, statutes, digests, citators and law reviews had about ended, though these, as now, were still the most important works in the law library. But you know, and certainly the lawyers in the downtown offices now realize, that they are no longer sufficient—something more is needed. And you cannot keep up with this added material by logic or memory, even if it is on the open shelves for all to see.

For example, you and your librarian know all about the conventional United States court reports, but are you so certain of remembering the increasingly numerous and important administrative reports of decisions, as those of the B.T.A., N.L.R.B., and the like, in their various forms? Do you think you always would remember when needed, such publications, not in sets, as the *Decisions of courts in cases under the Federal food and drugs act*, compiled by Mastin G. White and Otis H. Gates; or the *Digest of state laws relating to inheritance and estate taxes*, issued by the Bureau of the Census, or the numerous documents relating to trade barriers across state lines; or the *Digest of decisions of the Secretary of Agriculture under the perishable agricultural commodities act*; or the fine bibliographies of the Library of Congress, such as those on lynching and lynch law, the sales tax and the Supreme Court issue, or such time-saving works as the two pamphlets on *Provisions of federal law held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States*, and *United States Supreme Court cases declaring state laws unconstitutional, 1912-38*? State documents are even more difficult to remember without the assistance of a catalog. You are all familiar with the excellent monographic reports of the New York Law revision commission, in general, but how many of you can recollect offhand to what extent your own specialty has been treated therein? To be sure, these reports are ultimately bound and on the shelves where you can paw through them for what you want,

but why waste your time when an adequate catalog would tell you, or your librarian, in such short order?

Especially in the field of textbooks you need a catalog. Though we still have the monumental monographs of Wigmore, Williston and others, the later tendency of text writers is to write "more and more about less and less." That is, text writers more and more are specialists in limited fields rather than attempting to cover an entire topic, such as contracts or corporations. When one considers corporations, for example, the story of the medical student comes to mind. When registering, he was asked by the Dean whether he intended to specialize. "Yes, sir, in the diseases of the nostril." "Fine, which nostril?" For every general treatise such as Ballantine, Cook, or Fletcher, we have a dozen such as Anderson, *Limitations on the corporate entity*; Berle, *Modern corporation and private property*; Cushing, *Voting trusts*; Dodd, *Stock watering*; Doris, *Corporation meetings, minutes and regulations*; Farnsworth, *Residence and domicile of corporations*; etc., etc.

A catalog is useful, not only to you and the students, but to the library staff. If you have difficulty keeping track of the available literature in your own field, consider the librarian, who without a catalog is expected to be a specialist in all fields of legal literature. Even the race of supermen and women the A.A.L.L. is placing in law libraries these days cannot do it. But your librarian, if competent, can, with the aid of a good catalog, save you a great deal of time in your own research if you will let her, and a good catalog is worth while for this alone.

I say, a good catalog, because so many law library catalogs are not good. Often they fail to give needed information. For example, a common form of subject entry is the following:

TORTS

- Clark —1922.
- Cooley —1932.
- Pollock —1929.
- Salmond—1936.
- Street —1906.

This form of entry takes care, to some extent, of the general treatise, but not the specialized work, such as Bohlen's studies; Harrison, *Conspiracy as a crime and as a tort*; Charlesworth, *Liability for dangerous things*; Jeudwine, *Tort, crime, and police in medieval Britain*; Williams, *Liability for animals*; etc.

Cataloging is a highly complicated art if the result is to be reasonably brief, informative, logical and consistent; and it requires rigorous special training. Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress and a lawyer, has recently appointed a committee of eminent librarians to study cataloging procedure, with a view to simplifying it, and in this every librarian wishes him complete success. However, even when this committee's work has been adopted, cataloging will still be a complicated and technical matter, though, it is to be hoped, less so than at present. How, then, is reasonably adequate cataloging to be provided for the small law library with a limited budget?

A possible aid to the solution of this problem occurred to me three years ago, and at the expenditure of considerable time and money this has taken the concrete form which you see before you tonight in this model catalog.

Recently, a New York attorney, who had been invited by his alma mater to return as law librarian, had a long conference with me on the matter, and, as is so often the case, was more concerned about cataloging than anything else. With that perspicacity peculiar to lawyers, however, he suggested substantially the solution which in a modified form I have attempted to work out. He said that, since apparently most law libraries bought about the same books, as far as their various budgets permitted, it seemed a waste of time for each separate library to catalog these books. He suggested the advisability of a central co-operative cataloging bureau which would do the work according to the best principles and provide cards to subscribing libraries, thus splitting up the cost among a large group. This would at once ensure good form and low cost.

I was happy to be able to assure him that, in effect, this central bureau had been in operation for many years in the sale of printed catalog cards by the Library of Congress. However, there are many problems in organizing and maintaining a library catalog which are not taken care of by the mere printing of catalog cards. I will not undertake here the involved and technical reasons for this, but they do exist, and even with a mass of printed cards before her the untrained law librarian, without other help, would turn out a pretty poor catalog.

I cogitated on this problem at length and finally decided that a book of rules was not sufficient. Most people are poor visualizers and have difficulty in translating abstract principles into concrete applications unless they have had some special instruction. Why not, then, I reasoned, provide the law librarians untrained in cataloging with a group of concrete applications, so complete and so well organized as to cover every situation likely to arise in a small law library? In effect, to serve much the same purpose to the cataloger that the form book does to a lawyer.

The result is this model catalog which you see before you. A practical catalog for the law library of moderate size requires no less systematic planning than does the catalog for the law library of several hundred thousand volumes—and that planning is embodied in this catalog. Simplification, certainly, should be used, but it must be disciplined by the basic cataloging principles—consistency and good form.

To serve as a working model for the untrained person undertaking law cataloging, this catalog has been compiled, with the hope that among its numerous examples may be found the solution of every point which baffles the cataloger of a small collection. It has been my aim to provide in this catalog examples of every kind of publication which will be found in the library, so that, when a like publication is acquired by the library using the model catalog, a few moments will show just how it should be cataloged.

This catalog is based upon two lists of best titles available in the field of Anglo-American law, for a library of about 15,000 volumes. The first list was

compiled by Ray C. Lindquist, Librarian of the New York Law Institute, when he was a student in my course in law library administration, and is for a hypothetical New York library of 15,000 volumes, selected in accordance with A.A.L.S. standards. The New York emphasis is seen in the selection of local practice books only, but even here many of these books are of use in other jurisdictions. The second list, largely duplicating the first, is a *Selected list of books for the small law school library*, by Helen S. Moylan, Librarian of the University of Iowa Law School Library, and former President of the A.A.L.L. [32 LLJ 399, Nov. 1939]; [9 Am. L. S. Rev. 469, Dec. 1939].

The catalog includes, roughly, some 1,500 titles, and serves two purposes, the second of which will become of decidedly diminishing importance with the passage of time.

The first and primary purpose is, as I have stated above, to catalog numerous examples of all the usual kinds of material found in a well selected law library, so that the librarian may at all times have access to properly cataloged models to guide her. For this purpose the model catalog should retain its utility indefinitely, even though in time the actual works cataloged become obsolete.

The second purpose of the catalog is to catalog most of the books which are at present found in the law school library of 15,000 volumes. I believe that our method of selection makes reasonably certain that a small library possessing this catalog will find that three-quarters of its own holdings are duly cataloged therein.

However, although useful as a purchasing list, selected with great care by two excellent law librarians, the catalog is intended primarily as a cataloging project. No attempt, therefore, will be made to bring it or keep it up to date by replacing cards with those of later editions, or by adding successive volumes or supplements. To catalog such revisions or additions, use the cards in this catalog as models.

Since a chief aim in compiling this catalog was to demonstrate the technique of using printed Library of Congress cards, these cards have been employed whenever possible, which is about 90 per cent of the time. These printed cards may be purchased at prices ranging from four cents to one and one-half cents a card, depending upon how ordered and the number of copies of each card used. Instructions for ordering are given in a *Handbook of card distribution* published by the Library of Congress Card Section. If your law school is connected with a university, the chances are that its library has a depository catalog of Library of Congress cards, so that not only may your library see whether or not printed cards for its books exist, but also will be enabled to order what cards it wants, by card number, instead of by author, and thus secure a cheaper rate.

This catalog of some 1,500 titles contains about 5,000 cards. That is because it is a full dictionary catalog, containing entries for author and subject and, where advisable, title and editor. The number of subject cards used for each item depends upon various factors which need not be discussed here, but almost certainly in many cases your small library would use neither the same number of cards as

the Library of Congress nor the same subject headings. This is because the printed Library of Congress cards are intended for use in the great Library of Congress general catalog of all the books in that library, and not primarily for a law library at all. Thus, while the form of cataloging would ordinarily be the same for all libraries, the subject headings might not.

It should be stated here that the subject heading in a card catalog fulfills the same purpose as the main headings in the American Digest System, as "Attorney and Client," "Vendor and Purchaser," "Evidence," etc. In fact, there is more than a little correspondence between a library catalog and the tools for using a digest. The catalog's author cards are the table of cases of the digest; the subject entries are the key number headings; and the cross references, greatly reduced in number, are the Descriptive-Word Index.

Because the Library of Congress cards are intended for a general catalog, many subject headings indicated on them begin with the word "Law," meaningless in a law library catalog. For this and other reasons, law librarians use their own list of subject headings as aids to consistency and uniformity. These are usually based upon the Library of Congress list of subject headings for law, of 1911, as amplified and modified by the Library of Congress general list. We at Columbia think that our own list, published in 1939 and for sale by the Columbia University Bookstore, is the best such list. Certainly, it is the largest and by far the latest, and it has been used in compiling the model catalog.

There are other tools which should be employed by the inexperienced librarian who makes her own catalog with the aid of this catalog. Chief among these are two publications by Elsie Basset, longtime supervisor of cataloging in the Columbia University Law Library. The first is a 22-page mimeographed pamphlet, *Cataloging practices of the Law Library of Columbia University*. This pamphlet, used with the model catalog and printed Library of Congress cards, will enable an intelligent law librarian to compile a pretty good catalog for her library, since in simple form, with some examples, it answers most of the questions which will arise. The second, not yet published, is to be a comprehensive but reasonably brief manual of law library cataloging, covering all phases of the subject, with examples, cataloging aids and bibliographies. Then, of course, a detailed account of the model catalog itself, setting forth most of the techniques employed and special rules followed, will be provided.

I do not wish to be understood as implying that the use of the model catalog, the subject-heading list, and the manual of cataloging will transform an untrained law librarian into a finished cataloger or enable her to build a catalog, perfect and consistent in all respects, any more than that the use of a form book will enable an inexperienced lawyer to draft a satisfactory mortgage indenture. Cataloging is and will remain a difficult and technical subject, requiring arduous training and experience, in spite of aids such as these. I do maintain, however, that the intelligent use of these tools will provide a substitute which is reasonably satisfactory, and certainly far ahead of what many small and medium-sized libraries now have.

In response to a demonstrated need, the Columbia University School of Library Service, in cooperation with the Columbia University Law Library, has at a cost of about \$700.00 for cataloging work and cards, with the exclusion of this cabinet, produced this catalog. A most important question now remains to be solved; namely, how to make it available to libraries which need it.

I originally intended, after its service in connection with my course in law library administration during the summers, to use it as a loan catalog, sending it for a limited period of time to libraries asking for it. However, so many libraries have already asked for it that sending it around in this way would not serve all of them in years. Therefore, Dr. C. C. Williamson, Director of Libraries at Columbia, and I have cast about for some practicable means of distributing the catalog more generally. We have decided that photo-offset reproduction, in quantity, of these cards presents the best solution, and that is the one I offer you here tonight. On the basis of estimates secured when this project was started it is estimated that, if subscriptions are received from not less than fifty libraries, we can furnish a set of these cards on rag stock, arranged in order with proper subject headings, for \$50.00. This estimate did not include the set of guide cards nor, of course, the cabinet. Thus the cost to a subscribing library would be but a small fraction of the cost of making this original catalog, which, in addition to the cost of the cards themselves, occupied the time of an expert cataloger for several months.

This is, of course, purely a missionary work. Columbia does not expect to be paid for the cataloger's time in compiling the model catalog. We must, however, see enough income from subscriptions to meet the cost of reproducing the cards by photo-offset process. If at least fifty law libraries, not now possessed of adequate catalogs, will cooperate to the extent indicated in making an expert job of cataloging available to their users and staffs, we think we can do it. We have no doubt that what we offer will be worth many times that to them.

The catalog is here, and I shall be glad to show and explain it to any of you who are interested. I shall also be glad to take subscriptions from any who wish to cooperate, subject of course to a sufficient number being received to make the photo-reproduction possible. Yours and many other libraries will shortly receive a letter stating in sufficient detail the offer and terms.¹ (Applause.)

CHAIRMAN KIMBROUGH: Does anyone wish to ask Mr. Price any questions about this catalog? I am sure he would be glad to answer questions.

¹ Dr. C. C. Williamson, Director of Libraries of Columbia University, in a recent letter to the Editor said: . . . "It is nearly two years since I obtained an estimate and, of course, I could not hold a printer to an old estimate. . . . If the response to Mr. Price's talk at Chicago and to the proposal as it reaches libraries through the LAW LIBRARY JOURNAL is reasonably encouraging, I will then have new estimates prepared. . . . We would like to have libraries indicate their interest and perhaps even to give us tentative orders depending on final quotation. If approximately fifty libraries indicate that they will probably place an order I will then feel like going ahead. Letters and inquiries may be addressed to me personally."—Editor's note.

DEAN ALBERT J. FARRAH (University of Alabama School of Law): I would like to ask Mr. Price a question. About thirteen years ago our law school proceeded to catalog, according to the Dewey Decimal system, the entire law library containing then approximately 12,000 volumes. How would you do it?

MR. PRICE: You are confusing cataloging with classification. Cataloging is a description of a book on a card in such form that the reader will have a reasonable idea of it when he looks at the card, either under the author or subject, and it will tell him where that book can be found on the shelves; but classification is a different proposition. The classification says that certain books on corporations belong in a certain number and books on taxation belong in a certain number. The two bear no connection with each other.

DEAN FARRAH: No connection with the law library?

MR. PRICE: I mean, cataloging and classification are two different subjects. Classification is arrangement of books on the shelves by subject matter or some other criterion. The catalog is an inventory of a highly specialized field arranged by author, subject and title.

DEAN PAUL EVERETT RAYMOND (John B. Stetson University College of Law): What method is used in indicating on the card where the books are located?

MR. PRICE: I do not want to have my own classification confused with that of someone else. We ordinarily put an indication in the upper left hand corner, with some designated symbol. The symbol may say "R. R." for Reading Room, or it may give some other location. If you have a classification, you may put on an arbitrary number which may mean whatever you desire it to mean. Almost all law libraries use a book number or Cutter number to designate the author.

Cutter a long time ago got the idea that the proper spacing of names alphabetically could be done on a purely mathematical scheme, so he made tables which are a combination of letters and figures. If your name is Price—as my name is—it would be P-93 under the two-figure Cutter number; or, if you have a large library, you can use a four-number, that will scatter them all out. So almost all libraries that use a catalog at all have something of that sort, but that is purely for convenience in shelving so that editions of various authors will not get mixed up on the shelves when some untrained boy puts them away.

MR. THEODORE F. BOWES (Assistant Professor in Law, Syracuse University College of Law): Was it your idea that this catalog should be used as a model?

MR. PRICE: The idea primarily is that it is to be used as a model. At the present time this catalog contains few books later than 1938. It could be used, I think, in most libraries of comparable size (which is 15,000) which have a reasonable proportion of textbooks. It could be used to a great extent as an actual catalog, but I do not wish to be understood as advocating it primarily on that basis. To most small libraries it would be highly useful for that purpose, but my primary purpose was to use it as a very elaborate form book for catalogers. I think practically every possible situation—and there are certainly enough to confront a law library cataloger—is adequately met in this catalog.

DEAN FARRAH: Is the Dewey system I spoke of something that is still going to be useful in connection with cataloging?

MR. PRICE: The Dewey system would have no influence on this at all if your books were adequately cataloged in the first place—not *arranged* but adequately cataloged. Then you probably would not need this catalog because the Dewey system is not a system of cataloging; it is a system of arrangement, of classification.

I can say here that because of the fact that probably over 90 per cent of the books in any law library are large sets—such as the West Reporter System, and the statutes, and similar sets, which are arranged chronologically rather than by subject—very few law libraries have a subject classification as it is understood in other libraries. A chemistry library has a subject catalog down to an *n*th degree. Very few law libraries do that because of the fact, as I say, that nine-tenths of the books are not subject to that sort of an arrangement. The textbooks are. For a large library I personally firmly believe in subject classification. For a small library I do not, because I think it would be more bother than it is worth.

DEAN RAYMOND: In taking care of the continuations, what do you recommend?

MR. PRICE: By a continuation we mean something which comes out in serial form. That is a rough-and-ready definition. If the publication is still coming out, if it is alive, we have what we call an open entry in the catalog in which the last figure of a volume number of the last date, preceded by a dash, is in pencil. For example, when Vol. 309 of the U. S. Reports comes out, the cataloger erases the pencil number 308 and writes in 309, again in pencil. If it is a dead set and no longer issued, then that is put in in ink or typewritten in to indicate that it is a dead set.

Of course, this catalog does not take care of current sets. In the case of the *New York Law Journal* which comes out every day, or a weekly publication, we usually check those in a separate place and only enter those in the catalog when they form a complete volume. It is the same idea as your National Reporter System. When the advance sheets come in you check them in your receipt index as having been received, but you do not enter them in this catalog until the bound volumes come and you are ready to dispose of your advance sheets to the professors.

DEAN RAYMOND: Do you recommend the Library of Congress cards?

MR. PRICE: I certainly do recommend the L. C. cards but you probably would not use their subject headings in full, but should have a list compiled for a law library, and not for a general library, as the Library of Congress is. My subject heading here is the one I use in my own library of a quarter of a million volumes and has probably two or three times as many subject headings as a small library would want to use, but for your own library you would go through here and check the subject headings that you want to use. Then you have a consistent and uniform list of subject headings that by your own standards means

something and you do not make them up out of your head every time you get a new book on an allied subject.

DEAN RAYMOND: I was wondering about keeping this model catalog up-to-date. For a new book that came out you would use an L. C. card?

MR. PRICE: You would in many cases use different L. C. subject headings. The L. C. card is cheaper to buy than it is to make your own; it is much better done. The one difficulty we find with my own catalog is that they are likely to come out rather tardily.

Harking back to the West Publishing Company again, we make our own cards in many instances for the same reason that a lawyer will buy the National Reporter System: because the official reports will not come out soon enough to suit him. For use in the average library the L. C. cards do come out soon enough and you have an excellent job.

What your librarian has to do is to decide how many subject headings she wants to use. You will find that the subject headings will vary with the library in two ways. First, how many books have you got on the same subject? If you have a lot of books on corporations, you will use fewer subject headings for each book because you have your general heading over here in the catalog and you make your subject headings for your specialized ones. If you only have a few and you want to cover special chapters in a book which have not been covered in texts which have come out on that subject, you may make a subject heading for a chapter or part of a book which a larger library would not make.

Your librarian would have to decide how many subject headings she would want to use and she would order enough cards for those headings from the Card Division of the Library of Congress. When they came she probably would find out that she would not use exactly the same subject headings that they had. She would make the proper notations in the manner I have shown here in the model catalog, and file them, and the job of cataloging would be done. There are some very fine points which maybe a cataloger would think should be done a little differently, but cataloging—like lots of other things—is developing rather too formalistically, I think. That is what Mr. MacLeish has got in mind. One thing that this catalog will do is that you can get down to fundamentals, I believe, and make yourself an excellent and usable catalog without knowing too much about cataloging.

I certainly do not want to deprecate the knowledge of cataloging. We certainly cannot get along without catalogers and do not intend to. My point is this: So many of your libraries, particularly in the smaller schools, are one- and two-man jobs. You have a librarian who in many cases is a lawyer rather than a librarian—that is to say, rather than a specially trained librarian. This lawyer does not have the opportunity to go to library school and learn these things, but you still ought to have a decent catalog. My claim is that an intelligent person, by the use of these tools I have here, can cheaply build up a catalog which will be useful and good for your purposes and one of which you need not be ashamed.

When I went to Columbia University eleven years ago I was told there that

lawyers were a race apart; that you had to treat them specially; that they did not use the same service that anybody else would use; that the same tools that you find in a general library had to be specially constructed in a law library. I have no hesitation in stating—after eleven years of experience in a large library with students, research members of the faculty and an average of twenty-five or thirty practicing lawyers a day—that that is one hundred per cent nonsense.

To be specific: I was told that lawyers and the law faculty would not use what law librarians called reference service—what you people probably call research. I tried an experiment of that three years ago, because my experience was that if you offer these people an intelligent service they will use it and ask for more. So I reached down into Lucile Elliott's library in North Carolina and picked out a girl whom I had persuaded three years before to go to law school after she graduated from library school, and I got her up to Columbia to serve as a general law reference librarian. I was told that the students might use this service but the lawyers and the faculty would not, so I arranged with Miss Margaret Hall to prepare bibliographies and similar aids while she was educating these lawyers into using her service. From the very day she got there and these lawyers found out what she could do she has been swamped. The practicing lawyers, the faculty and the research men all use this service.

If you give your librarian and your faculty a catalog of this sort, I do not say it is going to make a perfect law school—do not mistake me—but it will be a useful tool to help these people, help you and save some of your time.

CHAIRMAN KIMBROUGH: Will you be here tomorrow, Mr. Price?

MR. PRICE: I will be here tomorrow and Sunday.

CHAIRMAN KIMBROUGH: I take it that Mr. Price will be glad to talk to any of you individually tomorrow if you would like to talk to him further about this catalog.

Before taking up the next paper I will call for a report of the Nominating Committee.

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, the Nominating Committee nominates the following:

Alvin E. Evans, University of Kentucky College of Law
Alfred A. Morrison, University of Cincinnati College of Law
Helen Newman, The George Washington University School of Law
Verle R. Seed, University of South Dakota School of Law
R. R. Ray, Southern Methodist University School of Law

We move the election of those five persons to serve as members of the Council for 1942.

William R. Arthur, *Chairman*
Charles J. Hilkey
Benjamin F. Boyer.

... The motion was duly seconded, voted upon and carried. ...

CHAIRMAN KIMBROUGH: The next paper on the program is "The Value of Classification and Pay Plans for Law School Libraries with a Summary of the Work of the Joint Committee," by Miss Alice Daspit of Louisiana State University.

THE VALUE OF CLASSIFICATION AND PAY PLANS FOR LAW SCHOOL LIBRARIES WITH A SUMMARY OF THE WORK OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE

ALICE DASPIT

Law Librarian, Louisiana State University

Dean Kimbrough, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Round Table, I find myself in a peculiar and rather unhappy position tonight. In the first place, contrary to the statement of your chairman, I do not have a paper to present, but merely a few informal remarks to make to you on the stated subject. Secondly, I am in a peculiar position because—as I very carefully explained to my dean before I left for Chicago—I am probably one of the few university law librarians in the United States who is almost satisfied with the amount she is paid and the conditions under which she works. In the next place, Mr. Price, I do not care for fireworks, particularly when I am in their center; but if there be fireworks tonight, I believe that they are always a healthy sign—particularly in a library meeting. Lastly, I come from a part of the country where we are taught from early childhood that there are three subjects that one does not safely discuss in polite society. One is politics; one is religion; and one is money matters.

However, I am going to ask you to go along with me tonight—in spite of the reputation this subject has for causing fireworks,¹ and in spite of the fact that it may be a delicate subject—in a broadminded way. I do not think there is any question but that progress has been made in the university law library field and that a great part of it is due to the broadmindedness of the administrators and the deans. The fact that you asked our Law Library Association two years ago to define a qualified librarian, and the fact that you have asked us, in conjunction with your own Association, to at least study the question of classification and pay plans is certainly an indication of your broadmindedness and interest, and an indication that you believe there is ample room for improvement.

As you probably know, personnel ratings are no new thing. In many professions there has been great progress already. Business, the government service, and other professions have already done much in this field. It was the American Library Association, representing the general library field, which made the first start for libraries in this direction. They have made several surveys in regard to municipal libraries and general university and college libraries, and within the past year when they learned that we were considering this subject they very kindly offered to make a preliminary survey with us in regard to the university law libraries.

¹ See 32 L. LIB. J. 365 at 368 and 371; and 33 L. LIB. J. 340 at 344.—Editor's note.

I want you to keep in mind that all of this is entirely suggestive. No law school is under any obligation to do anything, either now or after the survey is completed. There will be no requirements or standards set up that you and your schools will have to comply with. This is merely suggestive and we must have your cooperation.

This is the plan, briefly, as I, an individual with no background or experience in statistical methods, understand it; and, as I have said before, it will be a very general description: At our Law Library Association meeting in Toronto in June, 1940, thirteen law school librarians volunteered their services. They represent three types of libraries, according to size of book collection: the large library of around 100,000 volumes; the medium-sized library, which has a collection of approximately 40,000 or 50,000 volumes; and the small library, which consists of 16,000 to 19,000 volumes and up. These thirteen libraries represent staffs of from one to nine people; so, as you can see, we have a sort of cross-section of the whole law school library field.

This is what we hope to do: the American Library Association—entirely at its own expense—is going to send out what is called a job analysis form to each one of these thirteen libraries; or, if we decide that these thirteen are not representative, we will add more. The staff—it does not matter whether your staff is one individual or nine—is divided into three categories, according to the type of work performed: professional, sub-professional and clerical. The American Library Association has set out one hundred and twenty-three different types of duties listed under seven headings: Administration and public relations, Selection and acquisition, Preparation (including cataloging, classifying and mechanical preparation), Circulation, Reference, Instruction, and Physical upkeep.

For two weeks, with an intervening week between the first and the second week, each staff will set down on a chart every duty and function that it performs during the day, all of which will fall under the above indicated tasks. At the end of the two-week period, these forms will be returned to the American Library Association, when the time spent and the duties covered will be calculated. Then, after all thirteen reports are in, this information along with what it considers the minimum requirements for adequate library service, the American Library Association will set up a suggested standard for each group; that is, for a large library, a medium-sized library and a small library.

Having gotten this far, if these thirteen libraries are not satisfied with what the American Library Association recommends, we can either drop the project entirely or we can get an independent technician to do the job for us. But, on the other hand, if the thirteen libraries are satisfied with the standards that the American Library Association sets up, we will ask all law school libraries to participate in preparing rating analysis charts. This analysis, both quantitative and qualitative, considers building, book collection, and staff organization and operation; and the conclusions drawn are based upon the service load of the library. That is, it is based upon the number of faculty and students served, and the type of services which must be performed. A library of 16,000 volumes

may be giving as good service, in relation to the demands made upon it, as one of 100,000 volumes.

After these analyses are finished, if this project is carried to its logical conclusion, we will have positions classified—that is, whether professional, clerical, or sub-clerical—duties of, and necessary qualifications for these positions, and salary standards set up.

Even then, ladies and gentlemen, if you are not in favor of the project, the whole thing can be discarded. So this is the situation: In the first place, as I have said already, it is merely suggestive. We are under no obligation; we can drop it at any time. However, even if the project is dropped after the first job analysis forms are drawn up, we still will have the benefit of it. In other words, you may very easily find for yourselves through this analysis that you professional people are doing things that a clerk could do just as easily, and which would give more time for really professional functions. Such a survey as this should point out to staff members, in every library, weaknesses in their organization, and perhaps a faulty or overlapping allotment of duties.

Secondly, it seems to me that one of the most important things that we can deduce is the admission of our own weaknesses, and our very participation indicates our realization that there is perhaps something a little wrong with our library standards. And you know it takes a lot of courage sometimes to admit that.

Thirdly, the results of this survey will indicate to you deans and administrators the educational, personal and specialized qualifications which are necessary to fill the requirements of certain law library positions. What do you as administrators usually want when you look for a law librarian, and what are you prepared to pay? You usually want someone with library training or experience, and someone who is a law school graduate or who has had enough law to know legal terminology, at least. The possession of these qualifications requires time and money. You may be interested to know that there are no definite statistics that give the actual salaries paid to individual law librarians today; that is, they are all lumped together under library administration. But from my own experience, and from my own knowledge, I would say offhand that salaries are very low.

I will never forget the first day that I became a law librarian, after doing general library work for five years. I was a graduate of the Columbia University Library School, and as I was the only librarian on the campus who had been exposed to even one law course, I was therefore the logical person for the job. Arriving the first day, I found that the library quarters had been done over and that every book was piled from the floor to the ceiling in three rooms upstairs. My new boss greeted me with the words: "Miss Daspit, the first thing for you to do is to go up and separate the civil law from the common law."

If I ever had a sinking feeling it was then, and to my dying day I will remember a very kind gentleman on the faculty. He winked at me and said: "Miss Daspit, I love to handle books. Let's go upstairs." He happened to be

an authority on civil law bibliography. I spent my first year as a law librarian scarcely knowing what people were talking about when they mentioned legal subjects, and at the end of that year I went on leave of absence and got my law degree.

Now, you may say to me: "We have a law librarian who certainly does not have the qualifications which you mentioned a few moments ago." That may be very true, but within our Law Library Association we are trying to raise standards and it is only when you pay a librarian an adequate salary that he can improve his qualifications. Here, for the first time, there will be a basis for comparison and development. If you feel that your law library is not perhaps being adequately cared for in the university budget, here will be comparative statistics from other law school libraries to present to the powers that be.

So, ladies and gentlemen, I am asking you this evening to be broadminded and to go along with us and help us try this project. Our committee has recommended that it be continued as the Joint Committee of the Association of American Law Schools and the American Association of Law Libraries; and we are asking also that three additional members be placed upon this committee to represent the deans of the law schools, to help us with these problems.

There is just one final thought that I would like to leave with you. The term "classification" is not used in the sense of the library's place in relation to the whole university, but in its relation to other *law school libraries*. And secondly, this plan does not involve personalities. Any sort of personnel classification attempted has for its purpose the analysis of the job and not the individual. As the California State Personnel Board has stated:

"The classification must be entirely in terms of the job itself. . . . It may not under any circumstances take into account the qualifications of the individual holding the position, his family responsibilities, his political, or fraternal affiliations, his religious beliefs or the years of service on the job. The classification of the position where that position is occupied by an individual is as impersonal as if there were no incumbent."

This is the problem that I am putting before you tonight. If this is a controversial subject, this is the place to air it. We should like to have your criticisms. I started to say "constructive" criticisms, and I thought, "no," that is always unsatisfactory. We should like to have your criticisms. We know that progress has been made already and we are trying to continue to raise our professional standards. In this we ask your cooperation. (Applause.)

CHAIRMAN KIMBROUGH: We want to thank you, Miss Daspit, for your clear-cut presentation of this subject before us.

Would anyone like to ask Miss Daspit any question now? If not, the discussion will be led by Mr. Philip Marshall, Law Librarian of the University of Wisconsin.

MR. MARSHALL: How did this whole question of classification and pay plans arise? I think it came about because the faculty appreciated the fact that the librarians were giving valuable service. But faculties, deans and administrative

officials were not able to gaze into a crystal ball and find out just what their problems were. Librarians themselves did not know what the problems were, because problems differed among institutions, depending upon the locality, size of school, and even from semester to semester, depending on new teaching techniques and devices. So, at the 1938 Annual Meeting of the American Association of Law Libraries in St. Paul, the Committee on Cooperation with the Association of American Law Schools made a report containing a recommendation which had to do with the change in the Articles of the Association of American Law Schools. This change provided that, after September of 1940, each library of a member school shall be manned by a qualified librarian. The recommendation of the committee was as follows:

"... We also advise that an effort be made by this Association to formulate a definition of the term 'qualified librarian' and that a more extensive study of the problem of salaries of law librarians be made and the scope of the inquiry broadened to a greater extent than it has been possible for the Committee on Statistics to do, to the end of raising the professional standing of the law librarian and adequately compensating the qualified librarian for the proper and efficient management of the library."²

As a result of the above recommendation, at the 1939 Annual Meeting of the American Association of Law Libraries in San Francisco, the committee presented a plan for establishing standards for law librarians. Mind you, up to this date there had been no discussion of and no mention of the phrase "classification and pay plans." Some of you in the Law Library Association, as well as those of you in the Law School Association, may not have understood what Miss Das-pit was referring to when she mentioned the potential fireworks that might take place on the presentation of this subject. I was not present at the San Francisco meeting, but I understand that fireworks did follow the report because of the misunderstanding of its purpose on the part of some of the members who were not law school librarians. Each individual present knew his own qualifications, he knew what educational requirements he had, he knew how well qualified he was to do the job, and he knew how well he was doing it. Thank heaven, they had the good grace to be embarrassed about it after the meeting was over. I think all of us were a little bit afraid of having standards set down, although we knew we had to do something because looming up was this September 1940 requirement of the Association of American Law Schools.

Well, these tentative standards introduced at the San Francisco meeting were kicked about a bit and finally a motion was made referring them to the Executive Committee for its consideration with the advice and help of the committee which had presented them, the Committee on Cooperation with the Association of American Law Schools. Then, at the December 1939 meeting of the Executive Committee of the American Association of Law Libraries, a motion was adopted which, in effect, requested the Association of American Law Schools to authorize its Executive Committee to appoint a committee to participate with

² 31 L. LIB. J. 236.—Editor's note.

us in the study of classification and pay plans for law schools and law school libraries. This recommendation was adopted by the Law School Association, and that part of the work which was done by the former cooperating committee was given over to a committee bearing a new name: the Special Committee on Study of Classification and Pay Plans for Law School Libraries.

Here a very peculiar division took place. The Joint Committee on Cooperation between the Association of American Law Schools and the American Association of Law Libraries—not the Special Committee on Classification and Pay Plans—was charged with the duty of defining what a qualified librarian is and the classification and pay plan idea was now in the hands of this new special committee, although originally the two ideas were wedded. Here there was a divorce of the two, and perhaps rightfully so, because possibly this whole idea of classification and pay plans had no relationship at all to this definition of what a qualified librarian is.

We became intrigued with the idea of classification and pay plans. Just what is a classification and pay plan? I assure you that those of us on the committee cannot give an adequate answer. I at one time worked in a library in which the classification and pay plan was executed by Mr. Fred Telford, who is a recognized authority. Mr. Telford made his classification and pay plan for the city of Milwaukee, and the library classification and pay plan was done merely as a part of the entire municipal services.

My criticism of our work is this: I think we have a misnomer here on what we are trying to do. I do not think what we are trying to do is a classification and pay plan at all. I think the classification and pay plan presupposes that that classification and pay plan is done within a single budgetary unit because you cannot have classification unless you can understand the relationships of jobs to other jobs within a single budgetary setup. As all of the schools are in their own separate budgetary setting and cannot be divorced from them, it is practically impossible to have a classification and pay plan for all law libraries.

Some of the difficulties which arose over the committee's report at the San Francisco and Toronto meetings of the American Association of Law Libraries were due to the fact that law librarians who were not librarians of law schools—who were law librarians of various governmental agencies, bar associations, and others—thought that it directly concerned them. I think it does not. I think the whole problem is definitely one of the Association of American Law Schools libraries and not of the other law libraries, because it is tied up with this matter of standards, and the status of the librarian and his place in the law faculty. What are we going to do to raise his standards; to make the law faculty appreciate his work and to raise the standards of the law library in law schools generally?

We recommend the making of a job analysis. Every administrator of the member schools will be able to find out just what tasks are being performed by similar libraries of member schools—not tasks as they will be set forth in the

prospective manual of law library techniques in which each thing is worked out in detail, but a general picture of the average working day of the library staff.

After that job analysis is completed by the volunteer schools, I think that, if nothing further is done with it than just a study made of what law libraries are doing, it will be worth while to know what the library staff members are doing from day to day; how much administrators are paying expert librarians to do clerical jobs, and how much they are paying clerical help to do jobs that should be done by better trained people, and what is the proper place for these people. Even though the dean's office may be located right in the library, I still think that in many schools these library problems are not fully appreciated by the administrative staff any more than they are appreciated and understood by the librarians themselves.

With this note of confusion I close these remarks. I hope that we can slay this dragon of classification and pay plans once and for all. As a matter of fact, those of us on the committee are at times sorry the matter ever came up, but something has to be done about it one way or the other, and the committee members—in spite of the fact that the chairman, Miss Elliott, has labored hard and long on it—I know will not feel a bit hurt if we decide not to do it at all. But we did our best in making this recommendation for a job analysis and we call earnestly for your cooperation because we think that at least this job analysis, if it is properly done, will serve to educate librarians and to help inform administrators of the daily tasks of the staff members within their library, and to find out, as I have said, how much work is being done by clerks and how much clerical work is being done by trained people whose time could be better invested in some other pursuit. (Applause.)

CHAIRMAN KIMBROUGH: The last item on the program is a discussion of the "Relationship between the Work of the Committee on Classification and Pay Plans and the Work of the Joint Committee on Cooperation between the Association of American Law Schools and the American Association of Law Libraries," by William R. Roalfe, Law Librarian of Duke University.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WORK OF THE COMMITTEE ON CLASSIFICATION AND PAY PLANS AND WORK OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON COOPERATION BETWEEN THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN LAW SCHOOLS AND THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF LAW LIBRARIES

WILLIAM R. ROALFE

Law Librarian, Duke University

I regret that I have been called to speak before there has been further discussion because, according to the announced subject, my remarks should be both brief and directed to one specific point, namely, the relationship between these two committees which have somewhat similar titles and, therefore, have caused a great deal of confusion. As a matter of fact, I have, on several occasions,

been asked why we have two committees concerned with law school library problems. Obviously, this is a quite natural question, for there are always some advantages in coordinating all work relating to a particular field of endeavor. However, I believe that in this case there are some advantages in having two autonomous committees, not primarily because of the diversity of the problems involved and the numerous details to be considered (for these factors alone might suggest the necessity of coordination) but because, although the two committees have much in common from the long range point of view, their immediate objectives are necessarily different.

As I see it, the Classification and Pay Plans Committee is unavoidably completely occupied with detailed intensive studies which are expected to provide data for the formulation of fairly elaborate plans to be submitted at some future time. Because of the very nature of its work, it does not and, in fact, cannot be seriously concerned with the immediate and day-to-day policies of the two associations, for such a concern would necessarily distract the attention of its members.

On the other hand, the Joint Committee on Cooperation between the two associations, of which I am chairman, is in effect a committee created to go forward with the program of continuous collaboration between the two associations that has now been in operation for a number of years. This cooperation is not confined to one specific objective, however broad, but relates to any activities that will promote the improvement of the law school library service.

Perhaps the best way to make this clear is briefly to describe the duties of the Joint Committee on Cooperation. These fall under three general headings as follows:

First, to assist the Executive Committee of the Association of American Law Schools in enforcing the library requirements as set out in the Articles of Association of that Association, both by recommending interpretations where ambiguities exist and by making inspections of the libraries of schools seeking admission to membership and also of member schools, where this seems to be desirable.

Second, to suggest changes in the library requirements from time to time whenever it appears to be advisable. It is assumed that these will gradually be raised as has been the case in the past.

Third, to promote the further improvement of the law school library service by all other appropriate means, except to the extent that such work is being carried on by some other committee as is at present the case with Miss Elliott's group.

From the foregoing summary it should be clear that, so far as the two first objectives are concerned, the Joint Committee on Cooperation is primarily concerned with immediate problems. If anything is to be done about these matters, it must be done either at once or as soon as possible. The Executive Committee has present responsibilities calling for practical decisions with respect to which it has requested the assistance of law librarians, and our committee justifies this

part of its program on the ground that this is a responsibility that we should assume.

To this extent—that is, so far as enforcement of the Articles of Association is concerned—it should be noted that the Joint Committee on Cooperation is concerned with *minimum requirements*, not *maximum specifications*, such as should be held up to our profession as ideals—specifications such as Miss Elliott's committee plans to submit at a later date. This is of course only another way of saying that the committee of which I am chairman cannot avoid its responsibility to contribute something, however modest, to the work that is going on right now, while Miss Elliott's committee, for very good reasons, subordinates any immediate responsibility in order to contribute much more effectively at a later date.

The relationship of the two committees may be presented from another point of view, namely, the manner in which each contributes to the work of the other. As I see it, such contributions are as follows:

Whatever constructive work the committee of which I am chairman is able to do is just so much to the good, however short of the ideal goal this may fall. Certainly I, for one, believe that it would be shortsighted to sit around doing nothing about the law school libraries until some generally acceptable ideal standards are set up, for these reasons, among others—

First, because the Executive Committee of the Association of American Law Schools is obliged to make decisions affecting law school libraries whether we cooperate with them or not.

Second, because every effort should be made to see that decisions made now do not make further advances at a later date too difficult, and in this connection we should take account of the fact that mere inaction permits the development of situations that cannot later be altered without working manifest injustices on particular schools.

Third, because if we do not lay the foundation now by cooperating to the fullest extent in solving contemporary library problems we will be losing an opportunity to further an educational program that is absolutely indispensable to success for any such plans as Miss Elliott has in mind.

And finally, as to the contribution that Miss Elliott's committee may and should make: Certainly there is absolutely nothing in the work that we are doing that interferes with the submission and consideration of such plans as her committee has in mind, for continuous improvement is presupposed in all our work. The extent to which the plans submitted by her will meet with approval and will be acted upon cannot now be determined, but whether the ultimate effect is that of raising standards generally, or of modifying our approach to law school library problems, so long as the results are constructive, there need be no inconsistency between the work of the two committees. Certainly no member of the committee of which I am chairman has expressed any anxiety over the possibility that some other group may either solve the practical everyday problems with which we are grappling or may take over our responsibilities. Indeed, I feel perfectly certain

that the moment either of these alternatives appears on the horizon we will vote unanimously to disband. (Applause.)

CHAIRMAN KIMBROUGH: Is there any more discussion on this topic? If not, we will stand adjourned.

. . . The meeting adjourned at ten o'clock. . . .

CURRENT COMMENTS

Film Copies of U.S. Records and Briefs Received by Subscribing Libraries

SUBSCRIBERS TO THE LEGAL MICROFILM ASSOCIATION received at the end of November the first set of film copies of Records and Briefs of the United States Supreme Court. These films covered the papers submitted for the 1938 Term of the Court with the exception of papers in cases where Certiorari had been denied by the Court. The original papers in the Law Library of the University of Chicago covered twenty-seven lineal feet of shelving and ran to 92,000 pages. These 92,000 pages are contained in a total of thirty-five rolls of film. The great saving in shelf space, which is a matter of concern to libraries, is obvious.

The film was displayed on the occasion of the Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Iowa Law School and created very favorable comment from the many lawyers who saw it. The six original subscribers to The Legal Microfilm Association were the Law Libraries of Duke University, University of Pennsylvania, University of Michigan, University of Iowa, University of Wisconsin, and the Los Angeles County Law Library. While the work was in progress the Indiana University Law Library came in as a subscriber, so that seven sets of the films are now available in various parts of the country. Other library subscribers will be welcomed to the Association. This is a non-profit organization and the cost of the films is divided among the several subscribers. Therefore, the more numerous the subscribers the lower the cost to each one. Applications for membership may be addressed to Hobart R. Coffey, Law Librarian, University of Michigan, or Helen S. Moylan, Law Librarian, University of Iowa.

1940 List of Law Libraries Is Now Available

THE LIST OF LAW LIBRARIES IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA, 1940, has been published for the American Association of Law Libraries through the courtesy of the Commerce Clearing House, Inc., 214 N. Michigan Avenue, Chicago. This list, which has been compiled annually since 1923 by committees of the Association, was formerly printed in the Standard Legal Directory. When the Directory ceased publication, the Commerce Clearing House very generously agreed to take over the publication of this valuable material for the Association. The current list was compiled by a committee under the chairmanship of Mrs.

Margaret D. Stevens, law librarian of the University of Arizona. Copies have been mailed from the office of the Executive Secretary of the Association to all members. Non-members may obtain copies for \$2.00 each from the Commerce Clearing House.

Mid-Winter Meeting of A.A.L.L.

The mid-winter meeting of the Executive Committee of the American Association of Law Libraries which was held in the Edgewater Beach Hotel, Chicago, December 27 and 28, was attended by President Lewis W. Morse, law librarian of Cornell University; Executive Secretary Helen Newman, law librarian of The George Washington University; George A. Johnston, chief librarian, Law Society of Upper Canada; Alice M. Magee, librarian, Louisiana State Library; and Helen Ross, librarian of the Duluth Bar Library. The following librarians were also present at the invitation of the Executive Committee: Jean Ashman, law librarian of Indiana University; Harry Bitner, law librarian of the University of Kansas City; Hobart R. Coffey, law librarian of the University of Michigan; Forrest S. Drummond, law librarian of the University of Chicago; Alice Daspit, law librarian of Louisiana State University; Lucile Elliott, law librarian of the University of North Carolina; William S. Johnston, librarian of the Chicago Law Institute; Olive C. Lathrop, librarian of the Detroit Bar Association; Bernita J. Long, law librarian of the University of Illinois; Philip G. Marshall, law librarian of the University of Wisconsin; Alfred A. Morrison, law librarian of the University of Cincinnati; Helen S. Moylan, law librarian of the State University of Iowa; Oscar C. Orman, librarian of Washington University; Franklin O. Poole, librarian of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York; Miles O. Price, law librarian of Columbia University; Laurie H. Riggs, librarian of the Baltimore Bar Library; William R. Roalfe, law librarian of Duke University; and Richard R. Welling, chairman of faculty committee on the library, University of Virginia.

The agenda of the meeting included progress reports from committee chairmen and program arrangements for the 36th annual meeting of the Association. At the session on December 28, Mr. Albert Boni gave a demonstration of his Readex machine, explaining that microprint is more convenient to use than microfilm and more economical for reproducing over 10 copies.

Gauges Elected President of Washington, D. C., Law Librarians

Joseph Gauges, librarian of the U. S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, was elected President of the Law Librarian's Society of Washington, D. C., at its annual meeting on January 8, 1941. Other officers elected include Vice-President Helen Lally of the staff of the U. S. Supreme Court Library; Secretary-Treasurer Mary Virginia Lee, legislative reference librarian, Social Security Board; Board of Directors, Wanda Miller, librarian, General Counsel, U. S. Treasury, and Mrs. Rebecca Notz, law librarian of the Washington College of Law. Helen

Newman, law librarian, The George Washington University, and John T. Vance, law librarian of Congress, the retiring President, are also members of the Board of Directors. Bartholomew Landheer, a member of the staff of the law library of Congress and guest speaker at the meeting, gave a talk on "Dutch Libraries." Following his remarks, the Editor announced that a paper recently prepared by Dr. Landheer, "Legal Bibliography and Legal History of The Netherlands," will be published in the March number of the LAW LIBRARY JOURNAL.

Carolina Law Library Association Sponsors Exchange of Duplicate Legal Materials

The Carolina Law Library Association met in special session at Duke University on Monday, November 18, at a luncheon given in honor of Mr. and Mrs. Lewis W. Morse of Ithaca, New York. Other guests of honor were Mrs. Wm. R. Roalfe, Mrs. Dillard Gardner of Raleigh, N. C., and Mrs. Donald Y. Gulley of Wake Forest, N. C. The meeting was presided over by Miss Mary S. Covington, President of the Association, who introduced Mr. Morse, law librarian of the Cornell Law School and president of the American Association of Law Libraries. Mr. Morse spoke on the program of activities of the American Association of Law Libraries and pointed out how the work of a chapter such as the Carolina Law Library Association could be coordinated with this national program.

The Carolina Law Library Association is sponsoring an exchange of legal materials among North Carolina law libraries with Duke University Law Library acting as the exchange center and clearing house. Lists of duplicate holdings and want items of libraries wishing to participate in the exchange will be on record at the Duke University Library. In this way the party owning a special item and the library wanting it will be brought together, and from that point on the transaction will be between these two. Frequently lawyers have books which they would gladly donate to, or exchange with, a library, but do not know how to proceed in placing them where they are most needed. The exchange will solve this problem. The interest of the Carolina Law Library Association in the establishment and growth of bar libraries within the state led to the preparation, by a committee of the Association, Miss Mary S. Covington, reference librarian, Duke University, Chairman, of lists of suggested titles for the consideration of the purchasing committees of these libraries. The lists appeared in the February, 1940, issue of the *North Carolina Law Review*.

As a part of its program to stimulate interest in law libraries in general, the Carolina Law Library Association released to North Carolina papers early in November an article written by Judge Robert W. Winston entitled, "Law Libraries of Fifty Years Ago," and read before the Association at its 1940 Spring meeting.

ALICE M. MATTHEWS, librarian of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace for twenty-two years, retired from active library service on January 1. Her assistant, Helen Scanlon, has been appointed librarian.

A.A.L.L. Committees, 1940-1941

The following additional committee appointments have been made since the publication of the list of committees in the November number of the *LAW LIBRARY JOURNAL*:

Committee on New Members

Peter Q. Hern, *Chairman*

Harry Bitner
Alice Daspit

Marian Gould
Frederick B. Rothman

Helen A. Snook
William B. Stern

Special Joint Committee of Association of American Law Schools and American Association of Law Libraries on Classification and Pay Plans for Law School Libraries

Lucile Elliott, *Chairman*

Representing A.A.L.L.:

Jean Ashman
Alice Daspit
Forrest Drummond

Marian Gould
Frederick Hicks

Philip Marshall
Miles Price
Stanley West

Representing A.A.L.S.:

Dean Thomas Kimbrough

Dean William Leary
Dean Joseph McClain

Dean John H. Wigmore

Committee on Arrangements, Thirty-sixth Annual Meeting, Chamberlin Hotel, Old Point Comfort, Virginia

Dean W. H. Moreland, *Chairman*
Washington & Lee University
School of Law

Frances Farmer
Law Librarian
University of Richmond

John L. Lewis, Jr.
Law Librarian
College of William & Mary

Richard Welling, *Chairman of the*
Faculty Committee on the Library,
Law School, University of Virginia

DOING BUSINESS UNDER THE DEFENSE PROGRAM, an authoritative handbook of the laws governing business practices during rearmament, is a valuable reference manual for law librarians. The book includes the text of various laws governing defense business, and the text of forms and affidavits required by law. Subjects covered are: (1) bidding on defense contracts; (2) negotiation of government contracts; (3) the financing of expansion of plant facilities to handle government work; (4) meeting special labor requirements of government contracts; (5) tax amortization on defense facilities; (6) handling sales contracts and other relations with persons in military service. The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., Washington, D. C., has edited the handbook and will send it to interested persons for \$1 a copy.

HELEN VANGULPEN HARRIS, former research librarian at the University of California Law Library, is now Librarian and Deputy Attorney General of the State of California. Her new address is Attorney General's Office, State Building, San Francisco, California.

EVERETT H. NORTHPROP has resigned from the staff of the William C. Ruger Law Library of Syracuse University to accept appointment as Assistant State Supervisor, W.P.A. Library Extension and Assistance Project in Albany, New

York. Katherine O'Connor has succeeded Mr. Northrop as law librarian at Syracuse University.

**CHAMBERLIN HOTEL AT OLD POINT COMFORT, VIRGINIA,
SELECTED AS PLACE OF THIRTY-SIXTH ANNUAL MEETING OF
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF LAW LIBRARIES, JUNE
27 TO 30, 1941**

THE Chamberlin Hotel at Old Point Comfort, Virginia, will be the place of the Thirty-sixth Annual Meeting of the American Association of Law Libraries, June 27 to 30, inclusive, 1941. Selected by unanimous vote of the Executive Committee, in response to the suggestions of a number of our members that we meet at a resort hotel, The Chamberlin Hotel is situated in southeastern tidewater Virginia, overlooking Chesapeake Bay at Hampton Roads. The main entrance to the hotel faces the grounds of Fortress Monroe built in 1818 and now the most important coast artillery post on the Atlantic Coast. Within twenty miles drive of The Chamberlin are many of the shrines of colonial Virginia, including Williamsburg, Jamestown and Yorktown. A tour of these famous landmarks will be a part of the program of the Annual Meeting.

Program Announcements

The tentative program, arranged by the Executive Committee at its mid-winter meeting in Chicago, will feature a Question Box session with discussion of the following topics: "Arranging, Indexing and Binding of U. S. Supreme Court Appeal Papers and Records and Briefs of State Courts"; "Best Methods of Filing and Preserving U. S. Government Releases, Hearings, etc."; "Should a Book Fee Be Charged in Law School Libraries"? A Round Table on Cataloging Problems will be led by Miles O. Price, law librarian of Columbia University, who will exhibit the model card catalog.

Guest speakers at the Annual Meeting will include Major Raymond B. Bottom, President of the Daily Press, Newport News, Virginia, who will give the Address of Welcome. Mrs. John Garland Pollard, Secretary for Membership, Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, will speak at the afternoon session on June 27. Complete program announcements of business meetings, addresses and entertainment features will be published in the March number of the *LAW LIBRARY JOURNAL*.

Special Convention Rates at The Chamberlin Hotel

Members are urged to make their room reservations direct with Mr. Ralph Hewlett, Manager of the Chamberlin Hotel, as early as possible. The special convention rates, which include room, bath, meals, unlimited use of the outdoor salt water swimming pool, and dancing on the roof garden each evening, are as follows:

- \$7.00 per day per person, two persons in a room, twin beds and bath.
- \$8.00 per day per person, single room and bath.

Special Rate on Steamers to A.A.L.L. Members

The most convenient and enjoyable route to Old Point Comfort is via the steamers of the Norfolk and Washington Steamboat Company which leave Washington, D. C., at 6:30 P.M. and arrive at Old Point the following morning at 6:40. A special rate of \$9.75, round trip, has been obtained for our members who make this steamer trip at the time of our Annual Meeting. This rate will include round trip transportation on the steamer, stateroom (two persons to a room), dinner in each direction and breakfast on the return trip. Automobiles will be carried, subject to limit of space available on the steamer, for \$1.00 additional each way.

It is hoped that all members planning to attend the Annual Meeting will come to Washington, D. C., on Thursday, June 26, and be "on board" when the steamer leaves for Old Point Comfort at 6:30 P.M. Reservations for this trip should be made with Miss Helen Newman, Executive Secretary.

BOOK REVIEW

THE PRACTICES OF LAW PUBLISHERS AS THEY AFFECT LAW LIBRARIES. *By George Berdine Brown. Master of Arts Thesis in Library Science, University of Illinois, 1940. Pp. 77. Available on inter-library loan on application to the University of Illinois Library.*

The purpose of this research was to ascertain, "What are the methods used by the law book publisher that complicate or hinder the selection and purchase of books by law librarians." And with this piece of research the author has made a fine beginning in the investigation of law book publishing which should be continued by the law librarians if they ever hope to reach any solution to this problem.

Mr. Brown considered all the well-known complaints of law librarians in regard to law book publishing such as duplication, high cost, low discounts, padding, poor editorial work, numerous editions, etc. One chapter deals with a description of the various law book publishers and types of law books and presents a short history of the activities of legal organizations to improve law book publishing.

The author discussed in detail the demand by law librarians for a current trade bibliography of law books and the attempts to provide such a service.* The author has shown quite clearly that such a service would be of great benefit as an aid in selection which would possibly eliminate the purchasing of undesirable books.

In his introduction, Mr. Brown explains how he gathered his data by means of personal interviews and questionnaires because of the dearth of published material on this particular subject. He continues with a statement that in the

* Chapter II, "Book Selection" containing this discussion will be published in the March, 1941, number of the *LAW LIBRARY JOURNAL*.—Editor's note.

published material that he did find there was "no serious attempt to understand the publishers' point of view." This criticism is certainly worthy of serious consideration, and it is this defect of published material that the author overcomes by devoting a full chapter to the problems of the publisher. In overcoming this defect, Mr. Brown has made a definite contribution to the literature on this subject.

It has been this reviewer's personal experience in talking to law book salesmen that this criticism is just. There are certainly many "bottlenecks" in law book publishing that need correction, but law librarians have been selfish in their viewpoint and have not stopped to consider carefully the problems of the law book publisher.

A final point worthy of mention and consideration is the discovery by Mr. Brown, as a result of his investigations of law book purchasing to which he devotes a full chapter, that, in general, law librarians are not familiar with the best practices in purchasing books of a general nature. This criticism is certainly important in light of the fact that law libraries are buying more material every year in related fields.

Certainly on the items here discussed this manuscript deserves serious consideration and praise. As is suggested by the author of this thesis, there is definitely a need of further and more analytical investigation of this problem.

HARRY BITNER.

University of Kansas City
Law Library

CHECK LIST OF NATIONAL REPORTER SYSTEM

Revised to January 15, 1941

	Last Vol. to Appear		Last Vol. to Appear
Atlantic Reporter, Second Series.....	14	North Western Reporter	293
Advance Sheets	16	Advance Sheets	295
Federal Reporter, Second Series.....	113	Pacific Reporter, Second Series.....	105
Advance Sheets	115	Advance Sheets	107
Federal Supplement	33	South Eastern Reporter, Second Series	10
Advance Sheets	35	Advance Sheets	11
New York Supplement Reporter, Second		Southern Reporter	197
Series	20	Advance Sheets	198
Advance Sheets	23	South Western Reporter, Second Series	142
North Eastern Reporter, Second Series	28	Advance Sheets	145
Advance Sheets	30	Supreme Court Reporter.....	60
		Advance Sheets	61

ADVERTISEMENT

FOR SALE

Vols. 1 to 12 AMERICAN STATE TRIALS
(1914-1919). Good condition. Please make
offer. Wm. S. Johnston, 8 S. Dearborn
Street, Room 907, Chicago.

CHECK LIST OF U.S. ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS TO JANUARY 1, 1941

Prepared by EVERETT H. NORTHROP

Branch Librarian, College of Law Library, Syracuse University†

Attorney General

Official opinions

v. 1 (Aug. 21, 1791)—v. 38 (1937)*

Under House resolutions of Mar. 23, 1840 and Jul. 24, 1850, certain volumes not belonging to the regular numbered set were printed:

1. Opinions; from the beginning of the government to Mar. 1, 1841. Wash., Blair & Rives, 1841.
2. Opinions

v. 1 (Aug. 21, 1791)—v. 2 (Feb. 15, 1851)

Digest of opinions

3 volumes, (1789-1932), covers Volumes 1 to 32 inclusive

Board of Tax Appeals

Reports

v. 1 (Jul. 16, 1924)—v. 40 (Dec. 31, 1939)*

Commerce Court

Opinions; cases adjudged Jul. 20, 1911-Nov. 26, 1913

The decisions of this court appeared in pamphlet form with separate pagings. No bound volumes were ever published.

Commissioner of Patents

Decisions

1869—1939 *

Comptroller of the Currency

Digest of Decisions relating to National Banks

V. 1, 1864—V. 5, 1936

Comptroller General (General Accounting Office)

Decisions of the first comptroller

v. 1 (1880)—v. 6 (1885)

[v. 7] (May 1893-Sept. 1894)

Digest of decisions of the second comptroller

[v. 1] (1817)—v. 4 (Oct. 1, 1894)

The decisions of the Second Comptroller were never published in full.

Decisions of the comptroller of the treasury

v. 1 (1894)—v. 27 (1921)

Digest, 1 vol. (covers vols. 1-27, inclusive)

Decisions of the comptroller general

v. 1 (Jul. 1, 1921)—v. 18 (Jun. 30, 1939)*

Court of Claims

Reports submitted to the House of Representatives

These publications do not form part of any of the documents or reports series, but they have the following numbers in the serial number set:

1855-56	871-72	1859-60	1072-76
1856-57	915	1860-61	1108-10
1857-58	970-72	1861-62	1146-47
1858-59	1021	1862	1173

† Mr. Northrop has recently resigned from the staff of Syracuse University and is now Assistant State Supervisor, W.P.A. Library Extension and Assistance Project in Albany, N. Y.

The Editor is indebted to S. M. Banks of the John Byrne & Company, Washington, D. C., for making additions to this list and bringing it down to date.

* An asterisk denotes current series.

Cases decided

v. 1 (1863)—v. 90 (Mar. 31, 1940)*

Digest, Stull's Digest, 3 vols. (covers vols. 1-89, inclusive)

Court of Customs and Patent Appeals

Created Aug. 5, 1909 with the title COURT OF CUSTOMS APPEALS, with jurisdiction over appeals from the Board of General Appraisers, now the Customs Court.

Reports

v. 1 (Apr. 1910)—v. 16 (Apr. 1929)

Effective Apr. 1, 1929, the court was given jurisdiction over appeals from the Patent Office and its name changed to COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS.

Reports

v. 17 [pt. 1] Customs (Apr. 1929)—v. 27 [pt. 1] (Apr. 1940)*

v. 17 [pt. 2] Patents (Oct. 1929)—v. 27 [pt. 2] (Oct. 1940)*

Customs Court**Reports**

v. 1 (Jul. 1938 [including certain Jun. 1938 decisions])—v. 3 (Dec. 31, 1939)*

Federal Anti-Trust Decisions**Decisions**

v. 1 Oct. 13, 1890—v. 12. 1931

Federal Communications Commission**Reports**

v. 1 (Jul. 1934)—v. 6 (Feb. 28, 1939)*

Federal Power Commission**Opinions and decisions**

v. 1 (Jan. 1, 1931—Jun. 30, 1939)*

Federal Trade Commission**Decisions**

v. 1 (Mar. 16, 1915)—v. 29 (Nov. 30, 1939)*

Interior Department**Decisions**

v. 1 (Jul. 1881)—v. 56 (Nov. 28, 1938)*

As originally conceived, the publication entitled Decisions of the Department of the Interior relating to the public lands pertained almost exclusively to matters coming under the jurisdiction of the General Land Office, and a few matters from the Indian Office. On Jul. 7, 1930, the Secretary issued an order amending the title so as to read Decisions of the Department of the Interior, and directing that thereafter leading decisions and important opinions relating to all activities of the department be published in future volumes. Volumes 1 to 52 are referred to as the Land Decisions (L.D.). The abbreviation L.D. has reference to v. 53 and later volumes.

Decisions in appealed pension and bounty-land claims

v. 1 (1887)—v. 20

Decisions in appealed pension and retirement claims

v. 21—v. 22 (Jul. 12, 1930)

Interstate Commerce Commission**Reports**

v. 1 (Apr. 5, 1887)—v. 236 (Feb. 1940)*

From Apr. 1887 to Sep. 1894, two firms published the decisions, the L. K. Strouse Company and the Lawyers Cooperative Publishing Company. After each firm had printed 5 v. of decisions, the latter firm bought out the former

firm, and published 6 more volumes. Beginning with v. 12, the reports were published by the government. The first 5 v. of the Lawyers Cooperative set are considered unofficial. Care must be taken to cite them "I. C. Rep." instead of "I. C. C. Rep."

For some time the decisions were assembled in three groups: Finance Reports, Valuation Reports, and undesignated. The volume numbering, however, was continuous in one series until 1929.

Valuation reports

v. 22 (Jan. 1929)—v. 48 (Dec. 1939)*

v. 1—21 issued as v. 75, 84, 97, 103, 106, 108, 110, 114, 116, 119, 121, 125, 127, 130, 133, 134, 135, 137, 141, 143, 149, of the Reports.

Motor carrier cases

v. 1 (Jun. 1936)—v. 21 (Feb. 1940)* v. 25 (Finance reports, Mar.—Dec. 1939)

Judge Advocate General

Opinions

v. 1 (Apr. 1917)—v. 2 (1918)

[v. 3] (1919)—published in monthly pamphlets with a separate index for the year

The opinions have been published only as above. Digests have covered all opinions since 1862:

Sept. 3, 1862—Jan. 31, 1912

1912—1930 with 1931 suppl.

Suppl. 8, 1931-1938*

Labor Department

Opinions of the solicitor for the department of labor

dealing with workmen's compensation under the act . . . approved May 30, 1908. From Aug. 1908 to Apr. 1915. Wash., U. S. Govt. print. off., 1915.

Library of Congress (Copyright Office)

Decisions

1909-1939, 6 volumes

Maritime Commission

Reports

The rulings of the Shipping Board were published in printed separate leaflets, and this practice has been continued by the Maritime Commission. Each ruling is identified by its docket number (continuous under the Commission) and the names of the parties. These leaflets are given a volume number and are paged continuously (v. 2, p. 334, Jun. 4, 1940) and will form bound volumes when assembled.

National Labor Relations Board

National labor board

Decisions

[pt. 1] (Aug. 1933)—pt. 2 (Jul. 1934)

National labor relations board

Decisions

[v. 1] (Jul. 9, 1934)—v. 2 (Jun. 16, 1935)

Decisions and orders

v. 1 (Dec. 7, 1935)—v. 17 (Nov. 30, 1939)*

Post Office Department

Official opinions of assistant attorneys general for the post office department

v. 1 (1873)—v. 5

Official opinions of the solicitor for the post office department

v. 6—v. 8 (1937)*

These volumes are not distributed to depository libraries and are not sold by any government agency.

Railroad Adjustment Board Decisions

- First Division, (1936 to August 1940) Volumes 1 to 28 incl. (containing decisions from December 6th, 1934 to August 14th, 1940)
Second Division, (1937 to 1940) Volumes 1 to 3 inclusive (containing decisions from July 1st, 1934 to December 21st, 1939)
Third Division, (1936 to 1940) Volumes 1 to 9 inclusive (containing decisions from December 14th, 1934 to July 2nd, 1940)
Fourth Division, Volume 1; all published to date*

Railroad Labor Board

- Decisions
v. 1 (1920)—v. 6 (1925)

Securities and Exchange Commission

- Decisions and reports
v. 1 (Jul. 2, 1934)—v. 4, (May 31, 1939)*

Treasury Department

- Synopsis of decisions (title varies)
1868-1897
Treasury decisions under customs and other laws (title varies)
1898, v. 1—v. 2
v. 1 (1899)—v. 74 (Jun. 1939)*
The majority of the decisions rendered by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue from Dec. 24, 1864 to Dec. 31, 1897 appeared originally in the form of letters to internal revenue officers, published by contract in the Internal Revenue Record, a weekly issued in New York City. These appeared later in:
Digest of decisions and regulations made by the Commissioner of internal revenue . . . from Dec. 24, 1864 to Jun. 13, 1898.
Compilation of decisions rendered by the Commissioner of internal revenue [v. 1] (1898)—v. 6 (1903)
Treasury decisions under internal-revenue laws (title varies)
v. 7 (1904)—v. 34 (Dec. 1938)

Veterans' Administration

- Decisions of the administrator of veterans' affairs in appealed pension and civil service retirement cases
v. 1 (Jul. 3, 1930—Jun. 30, 1932)
Executive order no. 6731, Jun. 5, 1934, transferred the retirement of civilian employees to the Civil Service Commission. The separate decisions of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs since Mar. 21, 1931 in cases involving pensions for military service have been published in processed form; they have not been assembled.

Veterans' Bureau

- Digest of legal opinions relating to the U. S. Veterans' bureau
v. 1 (Oct. 1, 1923)—v. 3 (Jun. 30, 1926)
v. 4 (Jul.-Nov. 1926)—monthly issues, not cumulated

War Department

- Board of Contract Adjustment
Decisions
v. 1 (Jan. 22, 1919)—v. 6
Appeal Section, War Department Claims Board
Decisions
v. 7—v. 8 (Aug. 26, 1921)

CHECK LIST OF CURRENT AMERICAN STATE REPORTS AND SESSION LAWS EXCLUSIVE OF SIDE REPORTS

Revised to January 15, 1941

ALABAMA			
Publication	Dates of Regular Sessions	Source	Latest Vol. to Appear
Reports.....	. . .	West Pub. Co.....	239
App. Reports.....	. . .	West Pub. Co.....	28
Session laws.....	Quadrennial	Secretary of State.....	1939 Reg. & Ex.
ALASKA			
Reports.....	. . .	West Pub. Co.....	8
Session laws.....	Odd years	Secretary of Territory.....	1939
ARIZONA			
Reports.....	. . .	Bancroft, Whitney & Co.....	55
Session laws.....	Odd years	Secretary of State.....	Reg. 1939, 4th Spec. 1938
ARKANSAS			
Reports.....	. . .	Secretary of State.....	200
Session laws.....	Odd years	Secretary of State.....	Reg. 1939, Ex. 1938
CALIFORNIA			
Reports.....	. . .	Bancroft, Whitney & Co.....	15 (2d)
App. Reports.....	. . .	Bancroft, Whitney & Co.....	38 (2d)
California Decisions.....	. . .	Recorder Prtg. & Pub. Co.....	
*Advance Parts.....	. . .	Recorder Prtg. & Pub. Co.....	
Session laws.....	Odd years	Secretary of State.....	1939
			1940, 1st-4th Extra Sess., advance parts, Ja.-Oct. '40
CANAL ZONE			
Reports.....	. . .	Executive Secretary, Panama Canal, Balboa Heights, C. Z.....	3
COLORADO			
Reports.....	. . .	Bradford-Robinson Printing Co.....	104
Session laws.....	Odd years	Secretary of State.....	1939 Reg. & Ex.
CONNECTICUT			
Reports.....	. . .	E. E. Dissell & Co., Hartford, Conn....	126
* Advance parts.....	. . .	E. E. Dissell & Co., Hartford, Conn....	
Conn. Supp.....	. . .	Connecticut Law Journal Pub. Co.....	Vol. 7
Superior Ct. Rep.....	. . .	Bridgeport, Conn.....	
Common Pleas Rep.....	. . .	(Selected cases by Judges).....	
*Conn. Law Journal.....	. . .	Weekly continuations.....	
Session laws.....	Odd years	State Librarian.....	1939
DELAWARE			
Reports.....	. . .	State Librarian.....	38
Chancery reports.....	. . .	State Librarian.....	20
Session laws.....	Odd years	State Librarian.....	Reg. 1939
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
Appeals.....	. . .	West Pub. Co.....	71
U. S. District Court for the D. C. (formerly Supreme Ct.).....	. . .	National Law Book Co.....	1 N.S.
*Advance parts.....	. . .	National Law Book Co.....	2 N.S. No. 4
Acts Affecting District of Columbia.....	. . .	John Byrne & Co.....	41
FLORIDA			
Reports.....	. . .	E. O. Painter Ptg. Co., De Land.....	142
Session laws.....	Odd years	Secretary of State.....	1939
GEORGIA			
Reports.....	. . .	The Harrison Co.....	190
App. Reports.....	. . .	The Harrison Co.....	62
Session laws.....	Odd years	State Librarian.....	1939

HAWAII			
Publication	Dates of Regular Sessions	Source	Latest Vol. to Appear
Reports.....	. . .	Clerk of Supreme Court.....	34
*Advance parts.....	. . .	Clerk of Supreme Court.....	
Session laws.....	Odd years	Secretary of Territory.....	1939
IDAHO			
Reports.....	. . .	Bancroft, Whitney & Co.....	60
Session laws.....	Odd years	Capital News Pub. Co.....	Extra, 1937 Reg. 1939
ILLINOIS			
Reports.....	. . .	Samuel P. Irwin, Bloomington.....	373
*Advance parts.....	. . .	Samuel P. Irwin, Bloomington.....	
App. Reports.....	. . .	Callaghan & Co.....	305
*Advance parts.....	. . .	Callaghan & Co.....	
Court of Claims Reports.....	. . .	State Printer.....	10
Session laws.....	Odd years	Secretary of State.....	1939
			1940 1st Spec. Sess. Apr.-Je.
INDIANA			
Reports.....	. . .	Secretary of State.....	215
App. Reports.....	. . .	Secretary of State.....	106
Session laws.....	Odd years	Secretary of State.....	1939
IOWA			
Reports.....	. . .	Superintendent of Printing.....	227
Session laws.....	Odd years	Superintendent of Printing.....	Reg. 1939
KANSAS			
Reports.....	. . .	State Librarian.....	151
*Advance parts.....	. . .	State Librarian.....	
Session laws.....	Odd years	Secretary of State.....	1939
KENTUCKY			
Reports.....	. . .	State Librarian.....	279
*Advance parts.....	. . .	State Librarian.....	
Session laws.....	Even years	State Librarian.....	Reg. 1940
LOUISIANA			
Reports.....	. . .	West Pub. Co.....	194
Session laws.....	Even years	Secretary of State.....	Extra & Reg. 1940
MAINE			
Reports.....	. . .	Southward Anthoenson Press, Portland.....	136
Session laws.....	Odd years	State Librarian.....	Reg. 1939 Spec. Sess., May-Oct. '40
MARYLAND			
Reports.....	. . .	Century Printing Co., Baltimore.....	177
*Advance parts.....	. . .	Century Printing Co., Baltimore.....	
Session laws.....	Odd beginning with 1927	State Librarian.....	Reg. 1939
MASSACHUSETTS			
Reports.....	. . .	Wright & Potter Ptg. Co., Boston.....	302
Advance parts.....	. . .	Wright & Potter Ptg. Co., Boston.....	
Appellate Div. Reports.....	. . .	Lawyers' Brief & Pub. Co., Boston.....	2
Session laws.....	Odd years	Secretary of the Commonwealth.....	Reg. 1939
MICHIGAN			
Reports.....	. . .	Callaghan & Co.....	291
*Advance parts.....	. . .	Callaghan & Co.....	
Session laws.....	Odd years	Secretary of State.....	1939
MINNESOTA			
Reports.....	. . .	Review Pub. Co., St. Paul.....	207
Session laws.....	Odd years	Secretary of State.....	Reg. 1939

MISSISSIPPI			
Publication	Dates of Regular Sessions	Source	Latest Vol. to Appear
Reports.....	. . .	E. W. Stephens Pub. Co., Columbia, Mo.	187
Session laws.....	Even years	Secretary of State.....	Reg. 1940 Local & Priv. 1940
MISSOURI			
Reports.....	. . .	E. W. Stephens Pub. Co., Columbia	345
App. Reports.....	. . .	E. W. Stephens Pub. Co., Columbia	233
Session laws.....	Odd years	Secretary of State.....	1939
MONTANA			
Reports.....	. . .	Bancroft, Whitney & Co.	110
Session laws.....	Odd years	State Publishing Co., Helena.....	1939
NEBRASKA			
Reports.....	. . .	State Librarian.....	137
Session laws.....	Odd years	State Librarian.....	1939 Reg. 1940, Ex. Sess., Jan.
NEVADA			
Reports.....	. . .	Secretary of State.....	59
Session laws.....	Odd years	Secretary of State.....	1939
NEW HAMPSHIRE			
Reports.....	. . .	C. D. Hening, Lancaster, N. H., Reporter.....	89
*Advance parts.....	. . .	C. D. Hening, Lancaster, N. H.	
Session laws.....	Odd years	Secretary of State.....	1939
NEW JERSEY			
Law Reports.....	. . .	Soney & Sage Co.	123
Equity Reports.....	. . .	Soney & Sage Co.	127
Miscellaneous Reports.....	. . .	Soney & Sage Co.	17
Advance parts covering above.....	. . .	Soney & Sage Co.	
Session laws.....	Annual	Secretary of State.....	1940
NEW MEXICO			
Reports.....	. . .	West Pub. Co.	43
Session laws.....	Odd years	Secretary of State.....	Spec. 1938, Reg. 1939
NEW YORK			
Reports.....	. . .	J. B. Lyon Co., Albany.....	282
App. Div. Reports.....	. . .	J. B. Lyon Co.	258
N. Y. Miscellaneous.....	. . .	J. B. Lyon Co.	173
*Advance parts covering all the above.....	. . .	J. B. Lyon Co.	
State Department Reports.....	. . .	J. B. Lyon Co.	59
N. Y. Supplement.....	. . .	West Pub. Co.	20 (2d)
*Advance parts.....	. . .	West Pub. Co.	23 (2d)
Session laws.....	Annual	J. B. Lyon Co.	1940
NORTH CAROLINA			
Reports.....	. . .	Secretary of State.....	217
*Advance parts.....	. . .	Secretary of State.....	
Session laws.....	Odd years	Secretary of State.....	Extra 1938, Reg. 1939
NORTH DAKOTA			
Reports.....	. . .	Lawyers Co-op. Pub. Co.	69
Session laws.....	Odd years	Secretary of State.....	Reg. 1939
OHIO			
Reports.....	. . .	The F. J. Heer Printing Co., Columbus	136
App. Reports.....	. . .	The F. J. Heer Printing Co., Columbus	63
*Advance Reports.....	. . .	Ohio State Bar Ass'n, Columbus	
Ohio Opinions.....	. . .	W. H. Anderson Co., Cincinnati	18
Advance Reports.....	. . .	Ohio Law Rep. and Bull., Cincinnati	
Session laws.....	Odd years	Secretary of State.....	Reg. 1939, Ex. 1940

OKLAHOMA			
Publication	Dates of Regular Sessions	Source	Latest Vol. to Appear
Reports	. . .	Times Jour. Pub. Co., Oklahoma City	187
Criminal Reports	. . .	Times Jour. Pub. Co., Oklahoma City	67
Session laws	Odd years	Secretary of State	1939
OREGON			
Reports	. . .	Bancroft, Whitney & Co.	163
Session laws	Odd years	Secretary of State	1939
PENNSYLVANIA			
State Reports	. . .	Geo. T. Bisel & Co., Philadelphia	338
Superior Ct. Reports	. . .	Geo. T. Bisel & Co., Philadelphia	138
District and County Reports	. . .	Legal Intelligencer, Philadelphia	37
Advance parts of all the above	. . .	Legal Intelligencer, Philadelphia	
Session laws	Odd years	Bureau of Publication	Spec. Sess., Ap.-My. '40, Advance Sheets
PHILIPPINES			
Reports	. . .	Bureau Insular Affairs, Washington	59
Commonwealth Statutes	. . .	Dept. of Interior	1935-37
PUERTO RICO			
Reports	. . .	Dept. of Interior, Washington	44
Advance parts	. . .	Secretary-Reporter, San Juan	
Session laws	Annual	Dept. of Interior, Washington	1939-3d Reg.
RHODE ISLAND			
Reports	. . .	State Librarian	61
Superior Ct. Decisions	. . .	Pub. by R. I. Law Record, Providence	12
Acts and Resolves	Annual	State Librarian	Reg. & Ex. 1939
Public laws	Annual	State Librarian	1940
SOUTH CAROLINA			
Reports	. . .	R. L. Bryan, Columbia	192
*Advance parts	. . .	R. L. Bryan, Columbia	
Session laws	Annual	State Library	1940
SOUTH DAKOTA			
Reports	. . .	State Pub. Co., Pierre	66
Session laws	Odd years	Secretary of State	Reg. 1939
TENNESSEE			
Reports	. . .	E. W. Stephens Pub. Co., Columbia, Mo.	175
Court of Appeals	. . .	E. W. Stephens Pub. Co., Columbia, Mo.	23
Session laws	Odd years	Printing Dept., Tenn. Industrial School, Nashville	Reg. 1939 (Public) and (Private)
TEXAS			
Reports	. . .	Hicks-Gastom Co., Dallas	134
Criminal Reports	. . .	Hicks-Gastom Co., Dallas	138
Session laws	Odd years	Secretary of State	1939
UNITED STATES			
Reports, Official	. . .	Government Printing Office	309
*Advance parts	. . .	Government Printing Office	310
Reports L. Ed.	. . .	Lawyers Co-op. Pub. Co.	84
Advance parts	. . .	Lawyers Co-op. Pub. Co.	85
Sup. Ct. Rep.	. . .	West Pub. Co.	60
*Advance parts	. . .	West Pub. Co.	61
Att'y. Gen. Opinions	. . .	Government Printing Office	38
*Advance parts	. . .	Government Printing Office	39
Aviation reports	. . .	U. S. Aviation Reports, Inc., Baltimore	1940
Court of Claims	. . .	Government Printing Office	90

UNITED STATES—Continued

Publication	Dates of Regular Sessions	Source	Latest Vol. to Appear
Comptroller Gen. Dec.	. . .	Government Printing Office.....	18
Customs Court Reports	. . .	Government Printing Office.....	1
Customs and Patent Appeals: Customs..	. . .	Government Printing Office.....	27
(same): Patents..	. . .	Government Printing Office.....	27
Fed. Anti-Trust Dec.	. . .	Government Printing Office.....	12
Fed. Com. Com. Rep.	. . .	Government Printing Office.....	6
Fed. Power Com. Rep.	. . .	Government Printing Office.....	1
Federal Reporter..	. . .	West Pub. Co.....	113 (2d)
*Advance parts.....	. . .	West Pub. Co.....	115 (2d)
Federal Supp.....	. . .	West Pub. Co.....	33
*Advance parts.....	. . .	West Pub. Co.....	35
Fed. Trade Com. Dec.	. . .	Government Printing Office.....	29
*Advance parts.....	. . .	Government Printing Office.....	30
I. C. C. Rep.....	. . .	Government Printing Office.....	236
I. C. C. Motor Carrier Dec.	. . .	Government Printing Office.....	21
I. C. C. Valuation Rep.	. . .	Government Printing Office.....	48
Interior Dept., Decisions	. . .	Government Printing Office.....	56
Natl. Labor Rel. Bd. Decisions and Orders	. . .	Government Printing Office.....	17
Advance parts.....	. . .	Government Printing Office.....	26
Patents, Dec. of Com. of	. . .	Government Printing Office.....	1939
Puerto Rico Federal. Sec. and Ex. Com. Dec.	. . .	Lawyers Co-op. Pub. Co.....	13
Statutes at Large	. . .	Government Printing Office.....	4
Tax Appeals, Board of	. . .	Government Printing Office.....	53 Part 3
*Advance parts.....	. . .	Government Printing Office.....	40
Treasury Decisions..	. . .	Government Printing Office.....	42
			74
UTAH			
Reports.....	. . .	Arrow Press.....	98
Session laws.....	Odd years	Inland Ptg. Co., Kaysville.....	1939
VERMONT			
Reports.....	. . .	State Librarian.....	109
Session laws.....	Odd years	State Librarian.....	Reg. 1939
VIRGINIA			
Reports.....	. . .	Secretary of Commonwealth.....	175
Session laws.....	Even years	Secretary of Commonwealth.....	1940
WASHINGTON			
Reports.....	. . .	Bancroft, Whitney & Co.....	4 (2d)
Advance parts.....	. . .	Bancroft, Whitney & Co.....	
Session laws.....	Odd years	State Law Librarian.....	1939
WEST VIRGINIA			
Reports.....	. . .	Secretary of State.....	120
Supreme Ct. of App. Syllabus Service	. . .	Mrs. G. C. Goff, Charleston.....	17
Session laws.....	Odd years	Secretary of State.....	Reg. 1939
WISCONSIN			
Reports.....	. . .	Callaghan & Co.....	233
Session laws.....	Odd years	State Bur. of Purchase, Madison.....	1939
Biennial compilation by the State Reviser	. . .	State Bur. of Purchase, Madison.....	1939
WYOMING			
Reports.....	. . .	Prairie Pub. Co., Casper.....	55
Session laws.....	Odd years	Secretary of State.....	1939

* Advance parts pagged to correspond with permanent edition.

EXCHANGES

This page is offered free of charge as a service to our regular and institutional members who are invited to send to the Editor listings of their most urgently needed wants and their most valuable duplicates for exchange only. As many items as we have space for will be published in each number of the *LAW LIBRARY JOURNAL*.

Association of the Bar of the City of New York, 42 West 44th Street, N. Y. C., F. O. Poole, Librarian. Wanted: Alberta Law Quarterly, v. 3 to date. American Lawyer, v. 3, 8, 10-16. American Labor Legis. Review, all numbers. Case and Comment, V. 1-6; v. 9, nos. 11-12; v. 10, no. 7. Cream of the Law, any numbers. Denver Bar Ass'n Record, v. 1, nos. 1-3, 5-12; v. 2; v. 3, nos. 1-4, 6, 8 and on; v. 4. Dept. of Justice F. B. I. Bull., v. 1-6. Dickinson Law Review, v. 1-20, 22, 27, 29, 30, 34, 37. Georgetown Law Journal, v. 6, nos. 1, 2; v. 8, no. 1. Kentucky Law Journal, v. 1, nos. 1, 3; v. 2, nos. 1, 5, 6; v. 3, nos. 1, 3 to end vol. Law and Labor, v. 1, 3. Law Journal of the Students Bar Ass'n, v. 1, nos. 1, 3. Lawyers League Journal, Philippines, v. 1, nos. 1, 2; v. 2, nos. 1, 2, 8; v. 3, nos. 1, 3, 4, 5; v. 5, no. 7; v. 6, nos. 14-16, 18, 19. Lincoln Law Review, any numbers. North Carolina Journal of Law, v. 2, nos. 1-7, 8-12. Tax Magazine, v. 1, nos. 2, 11, 12; v. 4, no. 3. U. S. Trade Mark Bull., v. 11, no. 1; v. 14, nos. 2, 9; v. 15. U. of Detroit Bi-Monthly L. R., v. 1-8. Western Reserve L. J., any numbers. Women Lawyers Journal, any numbers. National Municipal Review, v. 1-14.

Loyola University Law Library, New Orleans, La., Solange Mille, Librarian. Wanted: Albany L. J., v. 1-12; v. 20. American L. R., v. 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9. Bi-Monthly L. R., v. 1-3. Boston Univ. L. R., v. 1, no. 1; v. 3, no. 1. California L. R., v. 1, nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6; v. 2, 3; v. 4, nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6; v. 5, nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6; v. 7; v. 8, nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5; v. 9, nos. 4, 5, 6; v. 10, nos. 1, 2, 4, 5; v. 11, 12, 13. Canadian Bar Review, v. 1-6; v. 7, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10; v. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13; v. 14, nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10. Fordham L. R., v. 1-3. Georgetown L. J., v. 1, nos. 2, 3, 4; v. 2; v. 3, nos. 2, 3, 4; v. 8, nos. 1, 3, 4; v. 9, no. 3; v. 4, 5, 6, 7; v. 10, nos. 1, 2; v. 12, no. 4. Green Bag, v. 1, 23, 24. Illinois L. R., v. 1-8, 10-18. John Marshall L. Q., v. 1, no. 4. Kentucky L. J., v. 1-12. Law Quarterly R., v. 1-50. National University L. R., v. 1-5. Notre Dame Lawyer, v. 1-3. North Carolina L. R., v. 1, no. 1. Nebraska Law Bull., v. 6, no. 2. St. Louis L. R., v. 1-13. Tennessee L. R., v. 1, no. 4; v. 3, no. 4; v. 4, no. 1. American Law Regis., v. 7 (O. S.), nos. 1, 7, 8; v. 25, 26, (N. S.).

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS

Joseph L. Andrews, Reference Librarian of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, 42 West 44th Street, New York City, has been appointed Assistant Editor of the *LAW LIBRARY JOURNAL* in Charge of Advertising. He succeeds Matthew A. McKavitt, Librarian of the Department of Justice, who resigned from the staff of the *JOURNAL* on January 8, 1941. All correspondence concerning advertising should be sent to Mr. Andrews at 42 West 44th Street, New York City.